



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/760,096	01/10/2001	Janet L. Benton	066516.0112	1687

7590 04/21/2006

Christopher W. Kennerly, Esq.
Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue, 6th Floor
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER

HAVAN, THU THAO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3624

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/760,096

Applicant(s)

BENTON ET AL.

Examiner

Thu Thao Havan

Art Unit

3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

Response to Amendment

Claims 1-26 are pending. This action is in response to the remarks received December 7, 2005.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims **1-26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell et al. (US 2006/0031147) in view of Abjanic (US 2004/0205597).

Re claims **1, 8, 15, and 22-26**, Bell teaches a system for mapping values collected in connection with creation of end-user orders for communications services to corresponding inter-provider orders (fig. 1 (element 174); Bell discloses mapping values by the XML

Art Unit: 3624

switching messages to establish connections for purchase orders or other business

transactions between users and providers), comprising:

an end-user ordering module operable (para. 0021-0022) to:

determine whether an end-user requested service item contained in a service provider product catalog (fig. 1 (element 134)) relates to a service item type having at least one associated developer defined label (DDL) (DDL as defined in page 10, lines 3-4 of the specification for collecting and processing information associated with the creation of Product Service Requests. Thus, Bell discloses DDL as company-user to develop sets of performance-defining rule in para. 0045, 0040-0044, and 0049), the DDL extending the attributes of the associated service item type by specifying an additional attribute for which a value may be collected from the end-user and supplied in connection with creation of an end-user order for the requested service item, the value not needed to complete the end-user order but collected and supplied to avoid needing to collect the value from the end-user in connection with subsequent creation of an inter-provider order that corresponds to the end-user order (para. 0028-0033 and 0040-0049);

if the requested service item relates to a service item type having at least one DDL, prompt a user of the end-user ordering module to collect from the end-user and supply a value for the additional DDL-specified attribute in connection with creation of the end-user order for the requested service item (para. 0041-0044); and

communicate the end-user order for use in subsequently creating the corresponding inter-provider order (para. 0073); and

Art Unit: 3624

an inter-provider ordering module coupled to the end-user ordering module and operable to (para. 0035-0036):

receive the end-user order (para. 0027);

determine whether the end-user order has a value for the additional DDL-specified attribute (para. 0033); and

if the end-user order has a value for the additional DDL-specified attribute, map the value from the end-user order to an appropriate field of the inter-provider order such that the value need not be collected from the end-user in connection with creation of the inter-provider order (para. 0033-0034).

However, Bell does not explicitly teach automatically map the value. On the other hand, Abjanic automatically map the value (para. 0024 and 0026). He discloses automatically and electronically detect that inventory has decreased below a threshold value and then automatically generate and send a purchase order to a supplier's server at a data center to request a shipment of additional suppliers or inventory. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to automatically map the value to an intended receiving party over a network via electronic communication as discloses in Abjanic.

Re claims **2, 9, and 16**, Bell teaches inter-provider order comprises an industry standard Local Service Request (para. 0026 and 0068). Bell discloses industry standard method.

Re claims **3, 10, and 17**, Bell teaches requested service item is an unbundled port; the additional DDL-specified attribute is selected from the group consisting of a Local Existing Account Number (LEAN) and a Local Existing Account Telephone Number (LEATN); and the

Art Unit: 3624

associated service item type is provided for mapping an unbundled port from an end-user order to an LSR (figs. 4-8; para. 0071).

Re claims **4, 11, and 18**, Bell teaches DDL allows a developer of the end-user ordering module to provide for collection of additional attribute values in response to an industry mandated change in LSR format without necessitating the development of new software (para. 0004).

Re claims **5, 12, and 19**, Bell teaches value is automatically mapped to appropriate fields of multiple forms included within the LSR (figs. 9 and 11).

Re claims **6, 13, and 20**, Bell teaches end-user ordering module is operable to relate the requested service item to a product specification and relate the product specification to a service item type to determine whether the requested service item relates to a service item type having a DDL (para. 0006 and 0009).

Re claims **7, 14, and 21**, Bell teaches end-user ordering module is further operable to validate that the value for the additional DDL-specified attribute has been supplied before communicating the end-user order (para. 0008). Bell gives the user flexibility to modify the ordering modules.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

DeMello et al, US 2005/0060266

Pgllies, III et al, US 2002/0072974

Koenig et al., US 2004/0111286

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Thao Havan whose telephone number is (571) 272-8111. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on (571) 272-6747. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct-uspto.gov/>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).

TTH
4/12/2006

VINCENT MILLIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

